7th February 1925] [The President]

which could not be resented by hon. Members. There are hon. Members who have not claimed travelling allowance perhaps for months and even for more than a year, and we have had considerable difficulty with the Audit department as regards such late claims. If we have information that they have attended, we can remind them as to their bills."

The hon. Mr. C. P RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"There are two or three pending cases of claims which are more than one year old."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I should like with your permission to put a blunt question. In case we do not attend the Council, we would be disentitled to the batta for the day, but I want to know—I do not speak of me personally—if I am in Madras and do not attend Council for a particular day, if I would be disentitled to claim batta."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If the hon. Member is in Madras and does not attend the Council on a particular day, I do not know whether he would be entitled or not. It is an audit matter altogether."

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—"I was told—but such question has not arisen in my own case—that in the case of mufassal members who come here and do not attend here every day but attend only on some days they are entitled to claim batta. The allowance is a halting allowance."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I believe this is the case if hon. Members for some reason or another do not sit throughout the whole of the session but attend on a day or two. I believe they are allowed travelling allowance and batta for the whole period. Nobody has questioned the accuracy of bills sent in by hon. Members on the ground of non-attendance and we are not going to make use of this information for that purpose. (Laughter.) I may assure hon. Members on that point, because it would be contrary to the rules to disallow a member's halting allowance merely because he did not attend on a particular day on which he was in Madras. It is only for days after the Council is over that the halting allowance is not paid."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—"I think there is nothing derogatory in these hon. Gentlemen signing in the book. As you said, Sir, it would be a historical record to have the signatures, because afterwards if we pass away (Laughter) it will be a record of attendance. So, your order may stand and we may proceed with the business."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am very reluctant to pass such an order. If it was passed, it could be disobeyed, as I would have no means of enforcing it."

IV

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL

The Secretary then laid on the table a copy of the [a] statement showing the resolutions of the House Committee and the action taken thereon.

11-30 a.m.

V

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1924-25.

Grant III.

* The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move :

'*That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs.* 65,000 ***under*** *Excise department—Transferred*'

---

* [a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 519-521 infra.

[Sir A. P. Patro] [7th February 1925

" The reason for making this demand of Rs. 65,000 is this. When the budget for 1924–25 was prepared it was difficult to make an exact estimate of the sum required under this head owing to the separation of the two departments. Consequently in the substitution of the fixed travelling allowance to the subordinate staff for the ordinary travelling allowance there was an underestimate. At that time the separation of the Excise department was under the consideration of the Government. Government was not therefore able to estimate accurately the provision required for the ordinary travelling allowance. Provisionally a sum of Rs. 20,000 was put into the budget as lump sum. But the separation of the Salt and Excise with effect from the 1st April 1924 necessitated a large number of transfers of officers and clerks in circles which had been reconstituted. The expenditure in the first two months of the current financial year was therefore necessarily very high. To meet these charges as well as the transfer of Abkāri officers from one place to another the provision was found to be quite inadequate. According to the actuals for the first eight months of the current year the expenditure for the whole year is estimated to amount to Rs. 85,000. So it is proposed to move a supplementary grant for Rs. 65,000 under Grant III. Excise "

Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I rise to a point of order with reference to the motion of my hon. Friend ? "

The hon. the President :—" The amendment has not yet been moved."

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar :—" I beg to move :

' *That the allotment of Rs. 65,000 under Grant III. Excise Department be reduced by Rs. 100.*'

" I shall not embarrass the hon. Minister for Excise by trying to elucidate from him whether he is still prepared to lay before this House any policy aiming at prohibition at this stage. I shall confine myself to know what his views are with regard to one or two matters of local importance and interest. I dare say, Sir, I can claim a soft corner of his heart for this city of Madras which he has not only made his home at present but which, if I may say so, has been his home for the last twenty-five years. Sir, the Corporation of Madras as a representative body of the citizens of this town several times recommended to the Madras Excise Licensing Board to remove shops of spirituous liquors and taverns to less objectionable sites. There is not one shop or tavern which is not objectionable even from the point of view of Excise Manual which the Government consider to be . . . "

Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" I think I will be well advised to raise the point of order at this stage as it is of some importance in respect of the general constitutional practice prevailing in this House and I should like to have your considered ruling on the subject. This is a supplementary demand brought forward by the hon. Minister. Under rule 32 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules

' An estimate shall be presented to the Council for a supplementary or additional grant when the amount voted in the budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year.'

" The hon. Minister says it is insufficient and brings forward this demand. The only relevant question at issue now is whether it is insufficient or

7th February 1925] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

whether there is a case made out for a supplementary demand. The question of policy, I do submit, does not arise on a supplemental demand at all. I am aware, Sir, and I prefaced my remarks with the statement that we have been allowing questions of policy to be discussed. When I was at Delhi recently I was witnessing the procedure of the larger assembly and it was sharply borne in my mind that it was rather a lax procedure that we have been adopting and according to the rules and past parliamentary practice that was a procedure which had no authority. In the particular instance Sir Frederick Whyte ruled that such a general question of policy was outside the scope of discussion on a supplementary demand. In the resolution brought forward by the Government of India regarding the steel protection bounty of 50 lakhs which was passed at a rate of Rs. 27 per ton an attempt was made by some hon. non-official Members to raise the question whether it deserved to be protected, whether the conditions of labour in the industry were such that that industry could get a bounty from the Government and other general questions of policy. The President of the Legislative Assembly ruled that the only question before the Assembly having regard to the Tariff Act which had already been passed and upon which the vote had already been taken, was whether a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs was a sufficient sum or whether the Council wanted it to be increased or decreased, whether the bounty of Rs. 27 was adequately provided, or whether it may be refused or increased. For the purpose of clarifying the issue I may state that the only question which is relevant to the issue here is whether the travelling allowance is necessary or is not necessary, whether the supplementary demand has to be made or need not be made, the question of decreasing the travelling allowance rate or increasing it, the question of stopping further travelling or of confining travelling to particular areas—these questions, I venture to submit, are relevant. But all questions of general policy on the administration of the Excise department or on the particular administration of any particular area, I venture to think, are not relevant to the issue at all. I am aware as I said that we have been allowing general discussions on some of these questions and for instance when the hon. Member for Irrigation brought in a proposal for a certain amount of supplementary demand for Trichinopoly irrigation my friend from Ganjam raised the question of the Girisola project. At that rate no supplementary demand can escape discussion on as wide a field as possible from Ganjam to Tinnevelly. It is not my intention to raise any objection against the question my hon. Friend has raised—I am glad he will have his say—but I venture to think it is time that we have a ruling on this subject and if I may put it very humbly that ruling would conduce to the conservation of both time and energy on the part of the Members of the Legislative Council."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think I should want some time to consider this matter. Speaking on the spur of the moment I should say that a supplementary grant is not entitled to exceptional treatment or to be treated otherwise than as a grant in the budget. However, I will look into this matter and I do not think it will take long But as we have allowed this practice for some time and as Government have, I presume, not furnished any memorandum stating that this additional sum is required for travelling allowance and hon. Members had no notice except that Rs. 65,000 was wanted for additional expenditure in the Excise department, I think Mr. Venkatachalam Chettiyar should be allowed to go on."

[7th February 1925

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I was saying that every one of the shops or taverns in the city of Madras is far in contravention of the rules of the Excise Manual which Government consider to be the guiding principles upon which they would allow the location of liquor shops. Time after time the Corporation of Madras protested against permission being granted to sites most objectionable from the point of view of the public. Time after time the Excise Licensing Board rejected the applications so much so that the Corporation was compelled to request Government to vest the right of location of these shops in themselves instead of entrusting it to the Excise Licensing Board. Government replied that they could not transfer the right from the Excise Licensing Board to the Corporation. As a matter of protest the representatives of the Corporation of Madras had to withdraw from the Excise Licensing Board. It therefore is practically devoid of the real non-official public opinion that was being exercised as hitherto. This might be turned round and it may be said that the Corporation itself lost the privilege of sending up its representatives to the Excise Licensing Board. But the Corporation, I am glad to say, is too much of a business body to allow its representatives to sit there not being able to do anything on the Excise Licensing Board. When they found that their representatives carried no weight on the committee and when there was the Revenue Board that was ready to set aside the Excise Licensing Board they thought it was useless to continue to sit and that either the right should be vested in the Corporation or the composition of the Board must be changed. Rumours have been afloat that the Madras Licensing Board was to be reconstituted with the same number of representatives from the Corporation as the Corporation hitherto enjoyed with one or two additions of temperance workers. I submit, Sir, that that won't improve matters. Unless the Corporation of Madras is strongly represented on the Excise Licensing Board nothing practical can come out of it.

"The second point that I wished to raise is a very old question. The Municipality of Madras was enjoying the privilege of levying licensing fees upon places used for the sale of spirituous liquors and intoxicants. From the year 1867 to 1884 and 1885 the Corporation was levying these fees. Since the Abkari Act was passed in 1884, the power of administering this right by the Corporation was withheld and in lieu of that a certain compensation was offered to the Corporation. The original compensation of 7,452 was in lieu of the amount of 16,000 which the Corporation was then getting. The Corporation rejected that offer and subsequently Government enhanced it to Rs. 13,607 which they are now getting. All the same they were empowered by the Municipal Acts to levy the licence fee upon these places and also there was the power reserved to the Government to withhold the sanction on the payment of equal compensation which the Corporation would lose by the withholding of the sanction by the Government. Through the amendment of the Municipal Act in 1904 the power of the Corporation to levy licence fees on places used for the sale of spirituous liquors was definitely omitted and the Government assured that the compensation which was hitherto being paid by the Government would continue to be paid. The present position is that the amount which the Government are now collecting in the shape of licence fees is nearly 11 lakhs of rupees. Time after time the Corporation brought to the notice of the Government that the compensation should be increased, and no definite reply seems to have been given by the Government.

7th February 1925] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar]

"It is now too late to say that the Government cannot entrust the power of selecting the sites for these shops to the Corporation of Madras. It was once said, I think in the year 1918, when the present City Municipal Act was in course of discussion, that the Corporation like any other local body had got the right of levying licence fees, and when this was pointed out to the Government, the Government very sympathetically answered that it was open to the non-official members in the Reformed Council to press this matter upon the Government when the subject became a Transferred one. Sir, the subject has become a Transferred one and continues to be a Transferred one, and no relief has yet been given to the Corporation. Recently, I am told the Corporation was in receipt of a Government order of 1922, but which was communicated only recently, that one of the recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee is that no share of the excise revenue can be claimed by local bodies. It is here that a difference has to be made between a share of excise revenue and the revenue collected on account of the licencing fees on these shops. We do not claim any share of the abkari revenue. That we entirely leave to the Government to enjoy. We want, Sir, the right which we were originally enjoying of levying licence fees upon places used for the sale of these intoxicants to be restored to us. One of the other recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee is that the local bodies ought not to depend upon the grants and subventions that the Government now and then were offering them. So far as the recommendations of this Committee were advantageous to the Government, I am glad they adopted them without any trouble. But whenever there happened to be any recommendations in favour of local bodies, they did not seem to think that those recommendations were entitled to their consideration. We agree, Sir, that local bodies ought not to depend upon the subventions and grants of the Provincial Government. But while we were receiving these subventions and grants, we were enjoying certain privileges which were since taken away. Now that these subventions are stopped, are we not entitled to get back the privileges which we were then enjoying? Till 1919 we have been continuously receiving from the Government grants for one or other objects. The last grant was in the year 1919. After the new Act came into force, we were told that no more grants will be given us. But we ask you to give us back our old privileges."

11-45 a.m.

* Mr. P. L. Moore:—"On a point of order, Sir. I think there is a little misapprehension in the hon. Member's mind when he says that they were told that no more grants would be given. Perhaps he is referring to the minor sanitary grants."

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar:—"Facts are stronger than arguments, however forcible they might be. The fact is that from 1919 we have not been receiving any grant, excepting grants towards water-works and drainage. Even this is because we have entered into an agreement with the Government that unless they undertook to contribute half the cost of the water-works and drainage works we could not carry them out. More than that we are not getting anything. And we did not press for any grant so long as we were very anxious about the restoration of our rights. In whatever shape the money came to us we were satisfied and we were going on with our work. Now the grants are stopped, and may I ask the hon. Member, Mr. Moore, if we will get anything to compensate us?"

[7th February 1925

* Mr. P. L. MOORE :—" I cannot understand what he is referring to. Is he referring to any particular grant? He says that no more grants were given. I do not understand what he means by it."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" I mean to say that no more grant under this head is given. It is not a grant at all but it is only a payment of money which you are giving to us when you entered into a contract some years ago to administer our right, and when you said that you would pay us Rs. 13,607. Whenever we find that for lack of funds we are unable to undertake a certain progressive or sanitary scheme, we used to approach Government, and we found that our request was sympathetically considered. From 1919 we have not been in receipt of any grants."

* The hon. Mr. R. A. GRAHAM :—" Rupees $6\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs this year?"

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" I told the House already that so far as drainage and water-works were concerned the Government was bound by an agreement to give us that grant. Only on the assurance that the Government would give us that grant, we have undertaken those drainage and water-works schemes. Apart from the water-works and drainage grants which the Government was giving, the Government was also giving previously additional grants for general purposes which are stopped. Now we have taken a number of new schemes on hand not only on the persuasion of the Government but also at the instance of the citizens of Madras, and we feel, Sir, the lack of funds. It is not only on account of lack of funds but we claim it as a right that the privilege that was taken away from us ought either to be given back to us or the amount which you are collecting under that head must be given to us deducting of course the expenses you might incur in the matter of collection. I beg to submit that the Government was only a trustee on behalf of the Corporation in the matter of the administration of this work, and as trustees you cannot disown your responsibility of discharging to the ward your trust when he attains the majority and claims from you back his right to administer, by handing over the trust.

" Sir, I beg to anticipate one or two objections that might be raised against us. We have recently been able to reduce our property tax by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But the hon. the Minister for Education is responsible for this. Our educational expenditure was Rs. 1 lakh till two or three years ago. Now, it has increased to Rs. 2·40 lakhs. Though last year we reduced the general property tax by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and levied a certain amount as an educational cess and asked for the Government's equal contribution towards that fund for education, the Government said that we were juggling with figures and that unless an educational cess was separately levied the Government could not contribute to the educational fund. Sir, while our expenditure for education has increased by about 150 per cent, the Government would not consider the desirability of contributing or taking upon themselves a portion of that burden but would ask the Corporation to levy an educational cess. We are alive to the most deplorable economic condition prevailing in the city. We feel that the city of Madras is very heavily taxed, and that unless we were able to reduce the property tax to accommodate the educational needs of the city and also to get, however small it may be, a contribution from the Government, we could not progress. That was why we reduced the property tax by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, so that we might recover this amount in the course of two or three years by increasing the education cess year after

7th February 1925] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar]

year. Even by reducing property tax by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and by levying $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent educational cess, we were able to introduce compulsion only in three divisions. Next year we hope to introduce compulsion in four more divisions. Then we will be compelled to levy additional tax in the shape of education cess. Till now, it was not possible for the Corporation of Madras to levy an increased tax either in the shape of education or general property tax."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid the hon. Member has introduced a very lengthy discussion. It is unfortunate that the Government did not state particularly what they wanted this money for. I understand it is wanted for additional travelling allowances."

* The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" It has been clearly stated that it is wanted for travelling allowances of officers of the department."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That was understood from the hon. the Minister's speech to-day, and not from the notice on the paper."

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I thought that you, Sir, made a sort of suggestion to the Government that with each grant they should also send a note explaining the details and we were expecting that a note as regards the supplementary grants would be circulated to us."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It is desirable that it should be. The inconvenience of it now is that the hon. Member is raising a very general question and to all appearance is refusing the Government the supplementary grant or is reducing it by Rs. 100 because something has not been done by the Government. However, I would deprecate the hon. Member going on with this sort of attack on the Government ; because he will have every opportunity to do so next month. When the budget is taken up, he can press his point. Apparently, this matter is not of such urgency that it should be voted upon to-day."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" I was following the rules and was moving the amendment on the procedure hitherto adopted in the House. I wanted to make clear to the Government the position about this grant. If this amendment had been ruled out of order, I would not have any complaint. But having been allowed, I do not see how my remarks have been irrelevant so far as this grant is concerned. I submit, Sir, that I do not deserve your deprecation."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I did not rule the hon. Member out of order. I only deprecated his going on with those remarks and requested him to defer them until a more suitable opportunity should arise. It is for him to do what he desires in the matter."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" With great respect to you, Sir, I may say that the hon. the Minister knows my position very clearly, and he also knows the requirements of the Corporation. I do not want that he should give me any unfavourable reply simply because I have taken him by surprise. In deference to you and also as a sort of convenience to the Government, I would bring this matter at the budget time when I hope the hon. the Minister for Education will be pleased to consider the legitimate claims and requirements of the Corporation for the sake of the starving poor people of this city and for the sake of the very deplorable condition of infantile mortality."

[7th February 1925

*Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I think, Sir, the members representing the Corporation of Madras are within their bounds in opposing this grant. We regret our inability to pay anything for the Excise department when our Corporation is being paid much less than what it ought to have. Rupees 13,000 is the grant that is given by the Government to the Corporation in lieu of their taking away the power of levying tax by the Corporation. That Rs. 13,000 was the average income of the Corporation forty years ago from that source, and according to that the Government fixed that grant. Now the Government is having over 9 lakhs of rupees from the licensing of liquor shops alone. What was Rs. 13,000 then is about ten lakhs now. Thus we are now paying to the Government much more than what we ought to pay. That is why we should not be asked to pay more. Let Madras be exempted from paying tax at least to this extent and let that portion of the excise revenue be given away to the Corporation. Therefore, I oppose this grant Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar was quite right in having tabled this amendment. Moreover, the Government has constituted a Licensing Board in which the Corporation has no power to raise its voice. Every resolution passed by the Corporation in this respect is defeated there, and, even when it is given effect to, the Board interferes and has its own way. The Corporation is the custodian of the sanitation of the city and of the moral well-being of the citizens of Madras. In *agraharams*, before a temple, before a church, they want to locate a toddy shop. Therefore, we oppose the Excise Minister coming forward for any grant from the tax-payers which will include Madras too.

12 noon. " Moreover, Sir, we, as total prohibitionists, do not want any revenue collected out of taxation on liquor; it is impure. But if the Government take away so much money, why should not they pay the Corporation a share of it or restore to the Corporation (laughter) the power of levying taxes ?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" I think the point raised by the hon. the Mover of the reduction lapses, the motion having now been withdrawn; but, with regard to certain remarks that fell from my hon. Friend, the Member for Madras, I am afraid it requires a great deal of elucidation. A lot of confusion has been introduced. . . ."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, on a point of order. I wish to know, if the hon. the Minister for Education concedes that my motion has been withdrawn, whether these arguments are relevant at all."

* The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" I am only replying to certain statements made by my hon. Friend, the Member for Madras. If it is the policy of the Madras Corporation not to touch tainted money, then it would have been . . ."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" It is not the policy of the Corporation, but it is the policy of certain members of the Corporation who are total prohibitionists "

* The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" I am glad of the correction. I now understand that it is not the policy of the Corporation as a whole but it is the policy of certain members thereof."

*Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Yes, Sir, as a protest against the policy of the Government, members representing the Corporation have in fact resigned their seats on the Licensing Board."

7th February 1925]

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—"On a point of order, Sir, may I know how these facts are all relevant to the point under consideration?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :— "The hon. Member for Madras has made certain observations and the hon. the Minister is only replying to them."

* The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, if the observations made by the hon. Member are not going to be put on record, I shall have no objection to refrain from further remarks."

The motion for reduction was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was then put to the House and carried and the grant made.

Grant XXVIII.

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"I beg to move:

'*That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs.* 1,23,827 *for grants to local bodies for the repair of damage to roads caused by the floods.*'

"Sir, the floods have seriously damaged communications in the districts of Salem, Malabar, the Nilgiris, South Kanara and Trichinopoly and repairs of the damages have cost us over a lakh of rupees. The presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipal councils concerned were asked to have detailed estimates prepared and get them sanctioned by competent authorities for the restoration of the damages caused to bridges. The Government accepted financial responsibility within certain limits in the case of trunk roads. The municipal chairmen were asked to get the approval of the Superintending Engineer and the amounts required over and above the usual allotment are these:

(The grants are for trunk roads only).

	RS.
Calicut Municipal Council	7,900
Palghat Municipal Council	2,600
Trichinopoly Municipal Council, repairs for the Southern trunk road and the Trichinopoly-Coimbatore road ..	50,000
Salem District Board, repair of Cauvery bridge, Kumarapalayam	15,900
South Kanara District Board, repair of trunk road, Mangalore and Mercara	27,097
The Nilgiris, repair of trunk road	20,330

These sums are required in addition to advance grants already made of Rs. 80,000 to Malabar district, of Rs. 40,000 to South Kanara district and of Rs. 30,000 to Trichinopoly district. The Nilgiris District Board was permitted to distribute out of the funds that remain as unspent balance. The estimates were sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer and these additional amounts are required for the current year for Malabar and Trichinopoly districts. I hope, Sir, the Council will have no objection to make the grant."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I only beg to point out that the way in which this House is treated as regards demands for supplementary grants deserves to be very much improved upon. Now, here is a case (and there have been many such instances) in which I could gather very little from the speeches made by the hon. Minister as to the exact details of the grant. We have not been given any idea as to what this demand is going to be

made for. I would request that at least some main heads under which the grant is sought to be spent might be given us. We are not aware beforehand for what purpose and under what heads the amount would be required. Personally speaking, I am very glad that some of this amount is going to be spent upon the repairs to the Mercara-Bangalore line. I am very thankful for it. But I only want to draw attention, as I have already done in a question that I had put, to the necessity for our having some idea beforehand of the demands that will be made by the hon. Ministers as well as by the other Members of the Treasury Bench. For want of these details we really feel that the demand has been sprung upon us. I would request that in future at least when such demands are brought forward the Government will be pleased to give us some idea as to them. In fact the hon. the Chief Minister has done so in one case and I hope the same thing would be done in future also."

* Mr. P. L. MOORE :—" Mr. President, Sir, arising out of the remarks of the hon. Member Mr. Saldanha, I should like to say that I agree that the hon. Members should have some such information when supplementary grants are moved. I have the details with regard to this particular demand but I hope there is no necessity for me to read it over again as the hon. the Minister has already explained it in detail to the House. I do think it is only fair that hon. Members should be given such information and shall see that this is done in future."

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" I am grateful to the hon. the Chief Minister for having come forward to help these districts that suffered from the devastations of floods. But I should like to know the policy of the Government in the matter of distribution that will be made for the damages. In the statement of places, the hon. Minister has only referred to Salem, and Trichinopoly and some other districts. But, Sir, my unfortunate district which has also recently suffered from floods and suffered badly too, has not had any mention. The whole dam is cut off and I immediately got an estimate prepared and sent it to the Superintending Engineer and after scrutiny by him I approached the Government for a grant. But I see the Government have not been pleased to make any grant. I should like to know what policy the Government are following in the matter of these grants ? "

* Mr. P. L. MOORE :—" May I ask the hon. Member if it is with reference to trunk roads ? "

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" Yes. "

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Is the hon. Member sure that the estimates have been approved by the Superintending Engineer ?"

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" Yes, Sir. I did obtain the permission of the Superintending Engineer. He told me to take it up to the Government. I therefore want to know if there is any policy in these matters of distribution of grants."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" We are, Sir, concerned with a particular calamity. But my hon. Friend refers to a general question. As I have stated in connexion with the floods of last year, we have asked the pesidents of local boards and the chairmen of municipal councils to ascertain the extent of damages and submit estimates of the repairs in the case of trunk roads and wherever the estimates are sanctioned by the local

authorities, the Government are willing to give grants considered necessary. In the particular case referred to by my hon. Friend I am not sure if the damage is connected with last year's floods I have referred to. That is the reason why no grant has been made."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I only wish to follow the remarks made by the hon. Member for Guntur. I think this is the occasion for the Government clearly to express their policy as to in what cases they will be in a position to make the grant. I only wish to lay emphasis upon the fact that where on account of the floods roads have been cut off the amount spent must not be debited to the normal expenditure of the local body concerned and the Government should be called upon to pay. Even in the case of trunk roads grants are made to the extent of Rs. 500 a mile. Whether the road is cut off or not this grant of Rs. 500 is not sufficient. I therefore urge that this should be taken as a standing principle, viz., where owing to floods a road has been cut off the expenditure should not be debited to the normal expenditure but should be treated as an expenditure for which Government should make the grant. I quite understand the difficulties of my hon. Friend from Guntur and I believe there may be several districts where for abnormal causes the roads have been cut off."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I am thankful to the hon. the Chief Minister for bringing forward this motion for grants for the districts that suffered in 1924. I am only sorry that my own district, Ganjam, is one of the districts that suffered very much in the year 1923. I would therefore appeal to him and request him to let me know as also the Council, as to what has been done regarding the severe damages that occurred in the other districts both in regard to the first class and second class bridges including the bridge in Itchapur which the hon. Minister has himself seen with his own eyes and His Excellency also has visited. I would therefore request him to let me and the Council know when he would take up the repairs of these bridges and whether he would be willing to allot money in this year's budget."

* The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" In reply to the question raised by my hon. Friend from Ganjam, I have only to say that some arrangements have already been made by the Ganjam district board and other questions are under consideration. As to the question raised by my hon. Friend from Nellore, I would say that the concession was made only in cases where damage is due to exceptional causes. There may be ordinarily floods in a year and the roads may be damaged. Such damage is not treated as being due to exceptional causes. If the damage is due to abnormal causes, the question of giving special grants will be considered."

12-15 p.m.

The motion was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

VI

THE MADRAS CIVIL COURTS BILL.

* The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to present the [a] report of the Select Committee, on recommittal, on the Bill to amend and consolidate the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873. I think hon.

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 521–524 infra.